



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

of men. It will be a happy thing for the preacher when he grasps the whole Christian gospel—nay, I had almost said the whole Nicaean Creed—with all the united force of heart and intellect and experience. For then assuredly he will become a prince of preachers. But the only creed he can ever preach with lasting and wide results will certainly be a creed which he has thrice built—in the receptive period of early con-

fidence, in the critical period of intellectual inquiry, and in the active period of life's experiences. When he has passed through these stages, there will be a ring of conviction that wins a hearing from the strong and the weak, the ambitious and the baffled, the toiling and the tempted, as he utters the solemn word *credo* on vital questions of the soul and its God, of time and eternity.

ST. PAUL'S VIEW OF THE RESURRECTION BODY (*Concluded*)

REV. A. E. WHATHAM

Trinity Episcopal Church, Louisville, Kentucky

We are now in a position to return to St. Paul's idea of the resurrection body, which includes the body alive at the Second Coming, and to say that he too viewed the resurrection body as the identical former body revived, altered solely in its power to resist decay, a power which altered merely the property of the substance of the body and not the substance itself. We see this in his statement, "Not for that we would be unclothed, but that we would be clothed upon, that what is mortal may be swallowed up of life" (II Cor. 5:4).

Now what is the significance of this expression, "clothed upon"? Clothed upon with what? Some scholars, pushing the illustration farther than the apostle ever meant it to be interpreted, have seen here a clothing with a spiritual

body to which St. Paul is supposed to allude in verse 1, in his statement touching our building of God eternal in the heavens. But this building is not a separate body, a sort of Ka or "double" which the Egyptians believed belonged to the man equally with his natural, physical body. It is merely the design of a body, similar to the design referred to in the words, "Thine eyes did see mine unformed substance; and in thy book they were all written, even the days that were ordained for me, when as yet there was none of them" (Ps. 139:16). As, therefore, with the present body, which was ever eternal in the mind of God, even so our future body is similarly eternal in his mind. That by which we shall therefore be clothed hereafter, according to the apostle, is not another body, but a power

existing by design eternal in the mind of God, and so said to be in the heavens, a power which shall change the property of our present material substance that what is now mortal in it, its property of decay, may be swallowed up of life (Lias, Cam. Bib., II, 64).

In view of the explanation, there is no necessity to see with Archbishop Bernard an expression in II Cor. 5:2, "our habitation which is from heaven," "which is not strictly consistent with the resurrection or retention of the former body as in I Cor., chap. 15." Dr. Bernard attempts to modify this criticism by asserting that "the notion of a previously prepared body brought to the soul to be animated by it surely could not have definitely presented itself to the apostle's mind without being at once discarded." He fails, however, to explain what he views as an "inconsistency" on the apostle's part, except "that it is not more than is allowable in speaking of a really indescribable event," which of course is no explanation (*op. cit.*). When, however, we come to verse 8 of this chapter, we have an undoubted inconsistency in the Apostle's argument, which Professor Massie describes as "a wistful modification rather than a contradiction of verses 2-4" (*NCB*, p. 287). But this "modification" amounts to an absolute inconsistency, since, whereas in verse 4 St. Paul represents that we shall not be unclothed at the death or dissolution of our present body, in verse 8 he contemplates our existence in an unclothed state when "absent from the body and . . . at home with the Lord." That we are not here building merely upon our imagination we see in St. Paul's definitely

expressed opinion that the change of the body of humiliation into a body of glory takes place at the Second Coming (Phil. 3:20, 21), and his equally definitely expressed opinion that he expected to take part in the resurrection of the dead (Phil. 3:11), facts which cause Dr. Bernard to say of this apostle, "We therefore conclude that he expects to be with the Lord before the Parousia in a disembodied state" (*op. cit.*). Here two important points call for consideration: (1) what was it that in St. Paul's mind constituted the "we" (II Cor. 5:4) which he did not wish to be unclothed; and (2) where was it that he expected to be with the Lord in an unclothed state? At the time of our Lord it was the belief of the majority of both the educated and uneducated that at the death of the body its spirit-replica came out of the body and went to sheol, the place of departed spirits, believed to be situated under and within the earth. By some this spirit-replica was regarded as practically lifeless and in this state remaining in sheol (Isa. 14:10; Ps. 115:17), but by others, and evidently the majority at the time of Christ, it was viewed as fully conscious and able to visit the upper earth (Luke 24:37, 39). It was, however, not this spirit-replica to which St. Paul had reference in the "we" which he was loath to have unclothed. This "we" can only be the entire man as we have him constituted in the term "living soul" (Gen. 2:7) where the body constituted part of the man and so of the "we." St. Paul, as we see (verses 1, 4), had no wish to be a dissolved "living soul," an unsubstantial even if a conscious shadow of this "we." He therefore assumes that at its

dissolution it will, at the same time that it is being dissolved, be reconstituted with henceforth a new power by which it will no longer be subject to dissolution. While, however, he is propounding this thought, he mixes it up with another thought which expresses the very idea he did not wish to hold, a thought by which he makes the body a detachable envelope, as it were, of the "we," which he says "may be absent from the body, and . . . at home with the Lord" (verse 9). We see, therefore, that Professor Findlay is wrong in saying, "St. Paul knows nothing of Hellenic or Oriental dualism. The body is not the detachable envelope, but the proper organ of the spirit. Its existing form of flesh and blood perishes, but only to be reconstituted in fitter fashion" ("Paul the Apostle," *HDB*, III, 729a). St. Paul certainly knew of Hellenic and Oriental dualism, since, while on the one hand he argues against it, on the other hand it is practically this dualism which he accepts in his contemplation of his being with the Lord in a disembodied state. What it was in St. Paul's mind which could form a disembodied "we" he does not tell us, but it was evidently the accepted spirit-replica, for this is what the other apostles supposed they saw when Jesus first appeared to them after the resurrection.

With regard to the place where St. Paul assumed that "we" would be with the Lord in a disembodied state between death and resurrection, he gives us no certainty. At the time he wrote the words we are examining it was believed that Jesus had passed into the highest heaven (Acts 1:9, 11; 7:55; cf. Mark 16:19), yet it could not possibly be in the highest heaven that St. Paul expected

to be when leaving the body at death. Our Lord intimated that after his death and before his resurrection he would be in paradise (Luke 23:43). St. Paul tells us that he was caught up into paradise, which he defines as "the third heaven" (II Cor. 12:2, 4), a paradise which evidently was not the locality intimated by Jesus. There were supposed to be two paradises, one in sheol and the other in heaven, but, as may be supposed, we have no definite information on the subject ("Paradise," *HDBs*).

In view of what we have now said on both the points just discussed, and as this is further added to our whole discussion of St. Paul's view of the resurrection body, we are forced to the conclusion that he knew no more about it than we do, in fact not as much, since what thoughts he expresses on the subject are based on the erroneous views held at the time with regard especially to the earth's formation and man's constitution both here and hereafter.

The New Testament presents us with a picture of a physical ascension of Christ into an upper heaven which Bishop Westcott tells us never took place as described, to which he adds that neither will our Lord's descension ever take place as described, conclusions fully accepted by modern biblical scholars generally (*The Revelation of the Risen Lord*, pp. 9, 180; *The Historic Faith*; cf. Dean Inge, *The Guardian*, May 13, 1910; December 8, 1911; December 6, 1912; Professor Swete, *ibid.*, December 13, 1912). But these conclusions, indorsed as they are by acknowledged biblical critics, indicate that the writers of the New Testament did not accurately describe the facts they were narrating,

what they describe being in its details imagination and not reality, that is, so far as Christ's going and coming are concerned. It is equally so with St. Paul with regard to his view of the resurrection body and the whole subject of man's future. He not only knew no more about it than we do, but his attempts to describe what he assumed were facts in the case were imaginings entirely lacking reality. But not only so, for he is not even consistent in his descriptions, such as they are, owing to which one of the latest scholars to write on this subject says of his eschatology that it "is not free from obscurities and ambiguities, and in the New Testament generally we are forced to recognize a mixture of inherited and original Christian elements" ("Eschatology," *Enc. Brit.*, 11th ed., p. 763*b*).

Now it might well be asked, in view of such a conclusion, "Why, then, study what St. Paul, or, in fact, what any of the writers in the New Testament have to say on the subject of the hereafter?" We answer, "For the simple reason that an accurate knowledge of what the New Testament does say on this matter will prevent the adoption of inaccurate views with regard to the teaching of the New Testament on the problem we are discussing." The New Testament may not be right in its views on this subject, but that is no reason why what it does say should be misrepresented, for such a misrepresentation will prevent us from adequately judging of the value of the particular New Testament teaching. For instance we have, we believe, shown that the view of such eminent scholars as Professor McGiffert, Canon Streeter, etc., as to what St. Paul says with regard to the character of the resurrection body

is not an accurate exegesis of what this apostle states on the subject. These scholars, as we have seen, claim that St. Paul teaches the Hellenistic view that at death the spirit-replica, or spiritual body, that is, the shade of the deceased, passes out of the material corpse to which it will never again be united, the corpse going to complete and final dissolution. In opposition to this we have shown, however, that the view of this matter held by Paul is, to quote from Dr. Salmond, "a real bodily resurrection, a return to the complete man" ("Eschatology," *HDB*, I, 755*b*), that is, a return of the spirit-replica to reconstitute the original body, soul, and spirit (I Thess. 5:23). How, indeed, in the face of such passages as Rom. 8:11, 23; II Cor. 4:14; Phil. 4:21, any scholar could see this matter otherwise than as explained by Dr. Salmond we are at a loss to understand, for no new body of another substance or element could possibly be spoken of as a mortal body quickened, a body redeemed, a body raised from the dead, a body of humiliation fashioned anew. These words show logically that the resurrection body is, in St. Paul's view, not a body of another substance, for that would be another body, but the identical body buried changed, not in substance, but merely in the property of its substance. We do not wonder that, taking the New Testament as it stands, the Roman Trentine Catechism carefully explains that the resurrection body is the identical body buried, and that the divines of the English church at the Reformation maintained the same view (Formularies of Henry VIII), a view which the Anglican church continues to hold in the Office for the Visitation of the Sick, which directs that

the patient shall be asked if he believes in the resurrection of the flesh, for this is the reading of the Apostles' Creed as it is recited to the sick man. If the teaching of the New Testament on the resurrection body is to be accepted by us today, then these ecclesiastical authorities are right in their insistence that we believe in the resurrection of the flesh that was buried, for, as Professor Findlay says on this problem as it is stated in the New Testament, we await " 'the redemption of the body,' which will be recovered from the grave and in its turn 'conformed to his body of glory'" (*op. cit.*, p. 725a). But science will have nothing to do with a resurrection body of the same particles of matter as composed the buried body, nor with a body coming out of the original tomb, and so, by those scientists who still accept the teaching of the New Testament on this subject, the New Testament is interpreted as holding before us "a body of some very different kind from the present . . . there is nothing to lead us to think that we are any more concerned with the body that was laid in the grave than is the butterfly with the skin which it cast off in passing from a caterpillar into a chrysalis. And what becomes of the body when done with . . . is not a matter with which religion is concerned" (*Natural Theology*, I, 202; *The Unseen Universe*, ed. 1894, pp. 49-51).

But according to the New Testament the body, as we have seen, is decidedly a matter with which religion is very much concerned, for, says Bishop Elliott, in referring to our present body, "To doubt that the body is an integral part of our nature, both here and hereafter, is to indulge in either a wild Mani-

chaeism, or a still wilder Docetism, which deserves neither attention nor confutation" (*op. cit.*, p. 108). Notwithstanding, however, the undoubted accuracy of this *theological* characterization of those who, like Canon Bonney, tell us that actually "the thing upon which St. Paul insists as essential is a continuity of personal consciousness" only (*op. cit.*, p. 112); and of those who like Professor McGiffert and Canon Streeter tell us that St. Paul rejects the idea that our present body will rise again, these scholars continue to maintain that their assertions are fully justified by the teaching of the New Testament, especially of St. Paul. In agreement with the demands of science they will have nothing whatever to do with the material body buried, asserting that what is raised, or rather passes out of the body at death, will be nothing but a spirit-body, that is, a body "of an entirely different nature" (McGiffert), or "element" (Westcott, *GR*, p. 142). Thus also the Bishop of Exeter and Dr. Plummer maintain that in I Cor., chap. 15, St. Paul teaches that we shall not, at the resurrection, "be raised with a body consisting of material particles" (*ICC*, p. 369), and they then cite the writers of the "Unseen Universe" in confirmation of their view of the resurrection body, or, to speak accurately, the body of our continuity, as a mere spirit-body.

All this attempt, however, to force an exegesis from Scripture which is foreign to its legitimate significance is not done without considerable contradiction and error in the statements of those making this effort. This is so, not only in the case of theologians, but also in that of other scholars. No such

interpretation can be given to the Egyptian seed-sowing in the tomb of the deceased as the Egyptologists Dr. Budge and Mr. Hall attempt to give; neither is Mr. Heard warranted in comparing St. Paul's teaching of the resurrection body with Bonnet's view of "an exquisite spiritual organization, invisibly pervading it," that is, the present material body, "and constituting its vital power" (*op. cit.*, p. 333). Equally contradictory and erroneous is Westcott when he tells us that the formation of our resurrection body may find its realization "in some other element," which he terms "a new creation," while he yet describes what "seems to be a dissolution" as a "transformation," since there is no "putting-off of the body, but the transfiguration of it" (*GR*, pp. 142, 153, 154). On the other hand, Robinson and Plummer say, "Nor is it a new creation" (p. 369). But perhaps the most serious error in Bishop Westcott's argument occurs in his description of the double change which took place in our Lord's body (1) at the the resurrection and (2) at the ascension. He tells us that Christ, at his ascension, "was no longer subject to the laws of the material order. . . . Christ is seen to be changed." Later he says, "The change which Christ revealed by the Ascension was not a change of place, but a change of state, not local, but spiritual" (*RRL*, pp. 7, 9, 180; *HF*, pp. 78, 80). In Westcott's rejection of a physical ascension for our Lord he is thus obliged, in his view of our Lord's resurrection body, to assume that our Lord's body passed through two changes, once at the resurrection and again at the ascension. Now of the last change we see plainly

that the New Testament knows *nothing*, but, on the contrary, that there was no such second change as Bishop Westcott assumes, our Lord ascending up to heaven with his physical body with which he rose from the grave. Now of course we agree with the Bishop that there was no going *up* of any such physical body, but the New Testament says there *was*, and, therefore, the fourth of the Thirty-nine Articles, attached to all Anglican prayer-books, is fully warranted, according to New Testament teaching, in asserting that "Christ did truly rise again from death, and took again his body, with flesh, bones, and all things pertaining to the perfection of Man's nature: wherewith he ascended into Heaven." Warranted as this fourth article is, however, by the teaching of the New Testament, what it says is absolutely rejected by Bishop Westcott and modern biblical scholarship generally and also by thoughtful men everywhere. Thus it is that Bishop Herbert Ryle, preaching recently on this subject, with special reference to the resurrection of our Lord, said, "It assured to mankind the nature of the personal life, not of the flesh, but of the spirit, continued beyond the death of the body" (*The Guardian*, December 16, 1915). In view of all the evidence now produced, what is the logical conclusion of the whole matter? It is this, namely, that the New Testament in its teaching, Pauline or otherwise, has no message whatever for us on the subject we have been discussing, since what it does say here is in absolute contradiction to the accepted teaching of science, as this is fully indorsed by modern biblical scholarship.